COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT IR TEAM INTERIM REPORT 4/3/06

The Collection Development IR Team has held 3 meetings over the past few months. Team members who participated in the meetings were:

Steve Quillen, Chair
Dottie Anderson
Doria Grimes
Kathy Kelly
Patti Marraro
Eileen McVey
Linda Pikula
Claire Steimle
Erie Taniuchi

Members unable to attend, but wishing to be kept inform were:

Maria Bello
Janet mason
Heather McCullough

Over the course of these meetings, the team has discussed the following items:

1. Where do we start? We start with almost anything NOAA has published. There needs to be an inventory of everything published in NOAA to determine its value. Value of the document and the difficulty in retaining it on the IR.
2. Types of publications to be considered:
   Technical Memorandums and Technical Reports
   Journals published by NOAA offices
   Presentations—from conferences, office presentations, etc.
   Articles in commercial journals authored by NOAA people—need to work with authors and publishers concerning copyright
   Gray literature—regardless of draft status.
   Policy changes—shows how the agency has changed focus over the years—historical value. Look at administrative notes, etc. Strategic plans and annual reports should be included.
   Publications etc. from office intranets
   Brown bag presentation materials from NOAA people
   Videos
   Datasets
   Preprints/Eprints
   Contract publications—need to look at contracts to determine whether document is copyrighted or not
   Sea Grant publications—published by grants from NOAA. Again, check the copyright statement. National Sea Grant has publications digitized an online—can we get files? Link to collection which may be old and

primitive? Some Sea Grant publications are sold but may be freely available within a year of publication. Base citation in IR and then flag to be uploaded. Look at Sea Grant Library for statements.

Archiving web sites. Use NARA guidelines. This is a records management issue.

Photos—from NOAA Photo Library and other NOAA sources.

3. Do not add non-NOAA research related material.
4. How are we going to deal with old digital collections? Will we be able to read the documents?
5. How are we going to archive politically sensitive material when those in charge leave and new folks come aboard, i.e., change in administration.
6. *Enforcement!!! NOAA Administrative Order (NAO 205-17). NOAA Central Library is official repository of NOAA publications. This includes print and all durable electronic products including CD-ROMs and other new technologies. Enforcement is the harvesting of material.* **Unfortunately this NAO is ignored**.
7. Can't make user afraid of submitting basic information. Provide user with certain basic fields of information needed. Technical expertise is required to properly archive document.
8. Who is responsible for adding content? Anyone can add. Content given to editor in the library, author, or proxy.
9. Staff must attend all NOAA related and sponsored conferences to inform NOAA personnel of the importance of their publications and presentations to the agency and to demonstrate digital repository. These include NOAA Webshop, AMS, and U.S. Coral Reef Task Force, new employee orientation, etc.
10. Copyright issues will be handled on a case by case basis. Government owns content of an IR if it is put together on Government time.
11. New staff for IR will be split evenly between technical and public services.
12. IR can be used as a tool similar to Web of Science to show how many times a NOAA author is cited by peers.

This led to some questions, which the team discussed:

Questions:
1. How will content be added? Content input by NOAA staff or IR editor.
2. Will deposit be mandatory? Yes, designated NAO mandatory and compliance supported by both marketing and collection teams.
3. Who will be responsible for adding content? Any NOAA staff can add and it will be reviewed and edited by designated library staff.
4. Who will be responsible for seeking content? Content Recruitment Coordinator—under public service.
5. What will be added? Anything directly funded by NOAA or produced by NOAA. Now? Yes. In the future? Yes, as long as NOAA exists.

Further discussions at the next meeting led to the following:

1. Suggestion was made for the inclusion of fisheries publication reviewers into the IR project and process. Claire provided list of the fisheries contacts. It is important to have list of publication advisory members from the other line offices and to get them involved with this project. *This is not an easy task, as many publication offices no longer exist, for example, the National Severe Storms Laboratory no longer exists. Contacted a number of non-MMFS laboratories, and have come up empty-handed.* **Questions to consider**: what is the approval process for all or each NMFS laboratory publications? If a NMFS employee submits a document directly into IR, when/how will the NMFS pub reviewers be involved in approving the document? Can a NOAA NMFS employee submit directly to IR or will they be precluded from doing so because of NMFS formal review process? Will only approved and published NMFS documents be allowed to be deposited into IR? Can the IR be promoted to NMFS so that it will be the one and only place where submitters and reviewers will find a working NMFS tech memo/document to edit or review before final approval?

2. **Overlap with other IR teams on this topic:**

    The Training and Marketing team is looking into the same area as written in the notes of their last meeting: *We need to also involve the editorial staff in the labs and other NOAA offices. Each division has its own internal document group. There is an existing publication protocol that needs to be followed/taken into consideration. We need to know how the publication office works in NOAA. The editorial staff has to give the go ahead for publishing. There is tight control here that we have to be aware of.*

    The IR Team on Policy, Metadata, etc., in their first meeting stated the following:

    CONTENT and content submission criteria.

All NOAA documents currently online and in public domain should be consider for inclusion into NOAA IR database. The priority should be given to the "official" NOAA document being in public domain, cleared of copyrights (i.e. the collaborative work documents). These documents are:

- *Official NOAA series, tech. memos and reports, etc.*
- *NOAA employees peer review journal articles, pre-prints, research papers, conference papers, gray literature, etc.*
- *NOAA websites, home pages, digital collections (all formats, videos, images, audio recordings, maps, scientific datasets, etc.)*
- *New items NOAA offices and NOAA employees publish officially online, including annual reports, procedures, guidelines and regulatory papers.*
- *New and historic NOAA publications selected for digitization by NOAA IR team or other NOAA personnel.*
- *NOAA publications currently available online through GPO or NTIS.*

Content should be both cumulative and maintain its perpetuity. Therefore, the submission criteria should also be considered. Items once submitted cannot be withdrawn, except in presumably rare cases (See below section 6. Withdrawals).

Also, NOAA IR shall aim to preserve and make accessible its digital content on a long-term basis. Digital preservation and long-term access are tightly linked together: each being meaningless without the other. NOAA IR should dictate the content

submission standard (.pdf, .txt, .doc – for textual documents; .tiff, .jpg – digital images; .mpg – digital videos; etc.)

3. Prioritized what should be in the collection, and weeding, if necessary. Also, include NOAA materials provided via Interlibrary Loan (as a borrower and as a lender).
4. The IR Team on Policy, Metadata etc states the following on weeding the IR:
    a. *Top priority should be something uniquely preserved by NOAA. Will there be a weeding policy in the IR because at some point weeding may be necessary. Withdrawals: There may be unique circumstances, when an IR document would be withdrawn. The appropriate justification should be made by the withdrawal requesting person or office. The policy should be written for this type of activity. It may be a similar process to weeding of the library collection. The documents may be withdrawn upon request of the author(s) or the appropriate NOAA office. An appropriate policy statement should be written to specify when the document may or should be withdrawn from the NOAA IR database:*
        i. *Superseded documents should be marked or withdrawn.*
        ii. *Scientifically incorrect ("bad science"), copyright infringement, allegations of plagiarism, etc. should be withdrawn.*
        iii. *Sensitive documents may be withdrawn upon a request of the appropriate authorities (GPO), (DHS, CIA, etc.).*
5. Evaluation Criteria for Selection (provided by Eileen):
    a. Content from authoritative and credible source.
    b. Subject relevant and meet the needs of the targeted audience.
    c. Technical requirements needed to provide access.
    d. Hardware and software requirements of users to access the collection.
    e. Cost acceptable, affordable, justified.
    f. Accessibility under the vendor licensing agreement.
    g. Quality of layout, design, graphics, and illustration acceptable.
    h. Navigating and searching functionality intuitive to users.
    i. Necessity, availability, and accessibility of archives.
    j. Published evaluation/references available.
    k. If free, the item shall improve or enhance the existing collection.
6. Dealing with editions. Keep latest edition in IR, note on record with reason why older editions not included.
7. The sample database should reflect titles that are already in SIRSI.
8. Journal archives should be a priority with the IR, but not in SIRSI. This brings up the issue of copyright. AMS issues a release for anything produced on Government time will not be copyrighted. AFS recognizes that articles containing all authors that are federal employees to be in the public domain and therefore, able for posting to public servers. Elsevier issues a release for preprints. The Ecological Society of America gives their permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of articles published in journals of the Ecological Society of America for personal use or educational use within one's home institution is granted without fee, provided that the first page or initial screen of a display includes the notice "Copyright by the Ecological Society of America," along with

the full citation, including the name of the author(s). Copyrights for components of a work owned by others than ESA must be honored.

9. Do we develop a specific collection policy for time/information sensitive materials, e.g. nautical charts? Are we going to have a policy/process on version control? Do we want to consider that some items we may want all versions as a history of the development -- such as policy documents? Or do we only want to have the current final version?

For the next meeting, team members looked at various IR collection development policies, which were from academic institutions. Based on these policies, the following points were discussed:

1. NOAA should have guidelines for publications which needs to be reviewed and to ensure documents which are submitted to the library comply with NOAA guidelines
2. The Content Recruitment Coordinator will be responsible for reviewing the compliance of the submitted document.
3. Who submits the document? The researcher or key personnel?
4. Enforcement necessary to ensure publications is submitted to the IR. New NOAA Administrative Order (NAO) may be needed. But the current NAO is ignored and there is no teeth to enforce it.
5. Submission to the IR MUST be part of the review process for new NOAA publications, but how to add it?
6. Must be very careful of copyright issues. Typical researcher is clueless on copyright.
7. Cannot take for granted office's home pages list all their publications, because they don't.

Finally, there was discussion of the various policies, and a couple of people felt the University of Oregon Policy could serve as the basis for a collection development policy. The next step is to take information from the group and start drafting a collection development policy. Focus should be on:

1. copyright
2. preservation
3. submission
4. withdrawal
5. revisions
6. content recruitment
7. communities

Drafting of a final collection development policy will begin in the next couple of weeks.